

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 21, 2005. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 25 - 32 and 34 - 45 currently stand for consideration, wherein claim 33 is being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, while claim 25 is being amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention by incorporating the recitation of claim 33. It is submitted that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Prior Art Rejections

The Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 25, 27, 28 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,325,821 to Gaschino et al.

Further, the Examiner again rejected claims 26 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaschino '821 in view of US patent No. 6,461,380 to Cox, and again rejected claims 38-44 as being unpatentable over Gaschino '821 in view of US Patent No. 6,273,913 to Wright et al.

Otherwise, we note that the Examiner still only objected to claims 29-33 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and that he would allow those claims if they are amended into independent form to include their base claim and any intervening claims.

As outlined above, claim 25 is being amended to incorporate the recitation of claim 33, whereby claim 25 as amended is distinguishable from the prior art of record. Since all the remaining claims depend from claim 25, it is submitted that all the remaining claims are also distinguishable from the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references discussed above, either by themselves or in combination with one another, can render each and every feature of the present invention as claimed obvious to one of skill in the art. As a result, the present invention as a whole is allowable over all the prior art references cited.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

January 23, 2006